



ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

By this Amendment, the rejected claims have been canceled, while certain of the remaining allowable dependent claims have been rewritten in independent form to make all pending claims allowable. In addition, the rewritten independent claims as well as many of the remaining dependent claims have also been amended for better consistency of term use and/or to correct minor informalities. Further new claims 53-55 have been added. It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

In the *Claims Suggestions* section of the outstanding Office Action, the examiner noted the various terminologies by which the "constant volume of cooled air V_c " was referred to in the claim 1, and suggested that these terminologies be made consistent. In addition, the examiner also suggested that other terminologies having similar problems also be corrected. Therefore, by this Amendment, the noted terminologies as well as other terminologies have been corrected in the claims. However, if the examiner notes any other terminologies which are not consistent, it is requested that these either be changed by examiner's amendment after consultation with the undersigned if needed or pointed out in a requirement for an amendment after allowance.

In the *Claims Objection* section of the Action, the examiner also noted two grammatical errors in claim 1. By this Amendment, these corrections have also been effected in the recitation of claim 1 (but this subject matter is now recited in the associated dependent claims now rewritten as independent claims). It will also be

noted that the recitation of the last paragraph of claim 1 has been revised for better clarity, as the grammatical construction therein was somewhat tortured and subject to confusion without reference to the teachings of the specification.

In the *Claims Rejection – 35 USC § 112* section, claims 1-50 (and presumably 51) were rejected as being definite because of the use of the term “significant” in the phrase “without significant loss of pressure” in independent claim 1. The term significant was used to signify that any loss of pressure would not be “important in effect”; and it is submitted that those of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated that the use of this term was not indefinite but merely used to convey the idea that some non-substantial loss of pressure might be unavoidable but that this would not effect the operation of the present invention. Thus, to better convey this idea and to overcome the rejection, the usage of “significant” has been changed to “substantial” in the rewritten claims, as this term is more readily understood and used in US practice. However, if the examiner would prefer some other terminology for the same effect, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss the substitution of such a term.

In the *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102* section, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by the Kim EP patent and/or by the Coleman patent. However, in the *Allowable Subject Matter* section, it was (again) indicated that dependent claims 5-50 (and presumably 51) all contained allowable subject matter and hence would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the § 112 rejection.

In view of the indication of allowable subject, certain dependent claims have been rewritten in independent form. For convenience, the following list shows those

allowable dependent claims now rewritten in independent form - together with the claims (directly or indirectly) dependent therefrom.

Claim 5 – with dependent claims 8-9 and 31-32.

Claim 6 – with dependent claim 29.

Claim 7 – with dependent claims 11 and 30.

Claim 12 - with dependent claims 13-16, 20-28, 35-38, 51 and (new claim) 52.

Claim 17 – with dependent claim 33.

Claim 18 – with dependent claims 19 and 34.

Claim 39 – with dependent claim 41.

Claim 40 – with dependent claim 42.

Claim 43 – with dependent claims 44-50.

As noted above, new independent claims 53-55 have also been added. These claims have subject matters similar to respective dependent claims 39, 40 and 43; but rewritten in independent form and without reciting the subject matter of claim 1 from which claims 39, 40 and 43 depended. However, it is submitted that just as these subject matters were allowable when dependent on claim 1, likewise these subject matters are also allowable when recited by themselves.

It will be appreciated that the above identification of the allowable claims and new independent claims includes all claims now pending; as the previously rejected claims 1-4 have all been canceled. Thus, it is submitted that all claims in the application are now allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is solicited.